



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/942,818	08/29/2001	Olivier Guiter	PALM-3693	8438

49637 7590 08/25/2009
BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.
9255 SUNSET BOULEVARD
SUITE 810
LOS ANGELES, CA 90069

EXAMINER

BECK, ALEXANDER S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2629

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/25/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/942,818
Filing Date: August 29, 2001
Appellants: GUITER ET AL.

Brenda Pomerance
For Appellant

SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINER'S ANSWER

The reply brief filed on June 20, 2008 has been entered and considered. The application has been forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision on the appeal.

Responsive to the reply brief under 37 CFR 41.41 filed on June 20, 2008 ("Reply"), a supplemental Examiner's Answer is set forth below:

Appellant notes that the examiner's answer mailed Apr. 30, 2008 ("Answer"), asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to put Derocher's display behind 3Com's touch screen with permanent printing to provide the user with another way to *enter* information (Reply, pp. 16 and 24). Examiner agrees. Appellant then argues that adding a display does not provide another way to *enter* information, it provides another way to *display* information (Reply, pp. 16 and 24). Examiner respectfully disagrees. While it is true that a display provides a way to *display* information, examiner respectfully submits that *a display taken together with a touch screen*, as detailed in the proposed combination of 3Com and Derocher in the rejection of claims 5 and 20 (Answer, pp. 4-5), provides another way to *enter* information (Derocher, col. 7, ll. 7-1-12). In other words, the display provides a way to *display* information and the touch screen overlaying the display provides another way to *enter* information based on the displayed information.

Appellant argues that even if the examiner had provided the motivation of "another way to *display* information", this would not be meaningful in context because local display capability is meaningful for Derocher given that the touch screen is not shown as being right next to a display, whereas such local display capability is already present in 3Com (Reply, p. 16). Examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that this argument has been addressed in the previous examiner's answer (Answer, p. 8).

Appellant argues that the cited prior art teaches away from the claimed signal for turning off the second display screen unit, as Kobayashi would lead one of ordinary skill to put a second display on 3Com's device, with the second display being visible only when the 3Com main display is closed, but since 3Com's device does not fold up as does Kobayashi's, there is no closure and no reason to add a second display (Reply, p. 17). Examiner respectfully disagrees. It

Art Unit: 2629

should be noted that 3Com as modified by Derocher introduced a second display (Answer, pp. 4-5). Furthermore, examiner respectfully submits that 3Com as modified by Derocher is analogous in art with Kobayashi since both are handheld portable electronic devices comprising multiple display screens. Kobayashi is made of record for teaching a hand held device comprising a first display screen unit and a second display screen unit, and displaying information on the first display screen unit automatically in response to a signal for turning off the second display screen unit (Kobayashi, ¶¶ [0030, 0034, 0035]). As one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate, this effectively reduces electric power consumed by selectively using the display screen units depending on existing conditions, e.g., the second display screen being on and off (Kobayashi, ¶ [0030]). Thus, examiner respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate the benefits of including the display switching of Kobayashi into a handheld electronic device having multiple displays such as the one of 3Com as modified by Derocher.

Appellant argues that none of the prior references teaches displaying a computer generated dialog enabling the receipt of an incoming phone call (Reply, pp. 18 and 28). Examiner respectfully discloses. Lenchik discloses a handheld personal digital assistant that is capable of receiving incoming calls (Lenchik, col. 4, ll. 53-64), inherently including data prompting a user for receipt of said incoming calls.

Appellant argues that one of ordinary skill would notice that 3Com already has a big main display area, and would be led away from adding more displays in order to minimize the cost, and reduce the weight, complexity and power consumption of the hand held device (Reply, p. 24). Examiner respectfully disagrees, and submits that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to modify 3Com in view of Lenchik to provide a user with another means for entering information.

Appellant argues that if a user desired to turn off a main display screen, there would be no need to keep the newly added small display screen on (Reply, p. 25). Examiner respectfully disagrees, and submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that the newly added

Art Unit: 2629

small display screen is provided for an additional means for entering information (Derocher, col. 7, ll. 1-12), and thus may be utilized without the necessity of the main display screen.

Appellant argues that adding a switch for turning off the main display screen while displaying information on a newly added small display screen to reduce power consumption is paradoxical (Reply, pp. 26-27). Examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that the newly added small display screen is provided for an additional means for entering information (Derocher, col. 7, ll. 1-12), and thus may be utilized without the necessity of the main display screen. Furthermore, examiner respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that power consumption is reduced by driving one display screen rather than two.

Appellant may file another reply brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.41 within two months of the date of mailing of this supplemental examiner's answer. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are not applicable to this two month time period. See 37 CFR 41.43(b)-(c).

A Technology Center Director or designee has approved this supplemental examiner's answer by signing below:



MARK R. POWELL
DIRECTOR
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600